

## **REMARKS**

Claims 20-22 and 24-33 are pending in the application; claim 23 is canceled with the instant amendment.

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The examiner has pointed out that the reference EP 0781634 has not been considered; as pointed out in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted 2/15/2005, in place of EP 0781634 applicant has submitted the equivalent US patent 5,836,226 (see International search report listing the patent family of EP 0781634).

### **Specification**

The language on pages 3 and 4 of the specification has been revised in order to clarify what is being described.

### **Claim Objections**

The language of claims 25 and 29 has been revised in view of examiner's remarks.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 20-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as applicant's invention.

In regard to claims 20-26 the term "film compound" is indefinite in examiner's view; this term has been changed to "film arrangement".

Claims 23 and 28 are rejected because of the term "neighboring ones"; claim 23 has been canceled and claim 28 has been amended to read "spacing between two adjacently positioned ones of the webs".

In claims 24 and 27 the examiner objects to the language as being confusing and suggests the use of language found on page 3, lines 10-18, of the specification. Applicant has used a different approach. In the amended claims 24 and 27, "several of the at least one...." is defined relative to a first direction; it is then defined that "said several ... extend parallel". In applicant's opinion this language is definite.

In claims 25 and 29 the examiner objects to the language as being confusing and suggests the use of language found on page 3, lines 19-26, of the specification. Applicant has used a different approach. In the amended claims 25 and 29, "several of the at least one...." is defined relative to first and second directions; it is then defined that "said several

... that extend in said first direction”. In applicant’s opinion this language is definite.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112 are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Graway et al. (US 5,055,734)*.

Claims 20 and 27 have been amended first of all to clarify that the dividing line, as is apparent from the drawings and from the context of the description, is a stamped gap. It is moreover defined that the stamped gap has a continuous width across a length of the stamped gap and that the stamped gap is interrupted across said length in a regular pattern by webs bridging the width of the at least one stamped gap.

This is clearly shown in the drawings.

*Graway et al. (US 5,055,734)* does not show a stamped gap of continuous width across the length of the stamped gap. The “stamped gap” between the parts 102 and 106 widens in both directions away from the webs 104 due to the round shape of the parts 106.

*Graway et al. (US 5,055,734)* therefore cannot anticipate the subject matter as claimed in claims 20 and 27 and their dependent claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102 are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 20, 21, 23-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Michalik (US 4,951,967)*.

Claims 22 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Graway et al. and Bechtel (US 6,402,328)*.

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Graway et al. and Abbott (US 4,499,566)*.

As pointed out above, the claims 20 and 27 define that the stamped gap as a dividing line has a continuous width across a length of the stamped gap and that the stamped gap is interrupted across said length in a regular pattern by webs bridging the width of the at least one stamped gap.

The examiner refers to Figs. 3 and 8 of *Michalik* as showing a dividing line 36 that

is interrupted by webs 39 and 63. The "dividing line" is comprised of U-shaped slots that are alternately pointing in opposite directions (Fig. 3) or S-shape slots (Fig. 8). In the direction of the length of the dividing line the individual slots are connected by webs 36 or 63.

This reference does not show a stamped gap with a continuous width across its length as the "U" or the "S" shapes have sections that extend laterally away from the dividing line and therefore provide a width across the length that changes with the laterally projecting sections of the "U" or "S". There are no webs arranged in a regular pattern across the length which webs bridge the continuous width of the stamped gap.

Claims 20 and 27 are therefore not obvious in view *Michalik (US 4,951,967)* and are believed to be allowable together with their dependent claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103 are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further objections or suggestions, the undersigned would appreciate a phone call or **e-mail** from the examiner to discuss appropriate amendments to place the application into condition for allowance.

Authorization is herewith given to charge any fees or any shortages in any fees required during prosecution of this application and not paid by other means to Patent and Trademark Office deposit account 50-1199.

Respectfully submitted on December 17, 2008,

/Gudrun E. Hockett/

---

Ms. Gudrun E. Hockett, Ph.D.  
Patent Agent, Registration No. 35,747  
Schubertstr. 15a  
42289 Wuppertal  
GERMANY  
Telephone: +49-202-257-0371  
US-Fax: (877) 470-9712  
gudrun.draudt@t-online.de

GEH